UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/527,691	03/17/2000	Masahiko Yamaguchi	35.C14352	3713

5514	7590	07/21/2004

FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER
ARANI, TAGHI T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2131	

DATE MAILED: 07/21/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

Advisory Action	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/527,691	YAMAGUCHI, MASAHIKO
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Taghi T. Arani	2131

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 25 May 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

a) ☒ The period for reply expires _3_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.

2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:

    (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);

    (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);

    (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or

    (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

       NOTE: _____.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: *See more*.

6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.

7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

    The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

    Claim(s) allowed: _____.

    Claim(s) objected to: _____.

    Claim(s) rejected: *1-18*.

    Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.

10. ☐ Other: _____.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Applicant's arguments filed 5/25/204 regarding the rejection of the claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) have been fully considered but they are not persuasive

Applicant argues that :

1- Patent No. 5,805,700 (Nardone et al.) fails to teach or suggets extracting an enclypted portion from received data, decrypting the extracted portion, and comhining the decrypted portion with the remaining portion that was not extracted.

2- Applicant further argues that that Jones et al. fails to remedy these deficiencies and that the the combination would fail to disclose or suggest at least the features of extracting a part of data, encrypting or decrypting it, and combining it with the remaining portion of data that was not extracted, and ouputing the combined data

3-The dependent claims are believed allowable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims, as well as for the additional features they recite.
For the foregoing reasons, Applicant requests favorable reconsideration,

Regarding argument 1 ., examiner disagrees with applicant.
Nardone et al. teach a Selector in figure 8, which "selects" a basic transfer unit for encryption. By selecting the basic transfer unit for encryption the unit is extracted from the remaining data portion that is not extracted/encrypted. The extracted portion is then combined with the remaining portion of the data that is not extracted and output as a partialy encrypted compressed video data (CVD+J from the Selector of figure 8.Though Nardone et al.
does not explicitly teach transmitting the combined data, though it is suggested by Nardone et al. in column 3, lines 59-61 , Jones discloses a transmitting step to transmitthe combined data of Nardone et al.

Regarding argument 2., examiner disagrees with applicant.
Nardone et al. teach a Selector in figure 8, which "selects" a basic transfer unit.
Though Nardone et al. does not explicitly teach decrypting the extracted podion, though it is suggested by
Nardone et al. in column 3, lines 59-61 , Jones discloses a decryptor to decrypt the extracted data. The extracted portion is then combine with the remaining podion of the data that is not extracted and output as combined data as taught by Nardone et al.

Regarding argument 3., examiner disagrees with applicant. Based on the arguments set fodh by the examiner for arguments 1 . and 2., the dependent claims stand as rejected.